



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,661	12/31/2003	Krishna Bharat	0026-0064	2814
44989	7590	04/28/2008	EXAMINER	
HARRITY SNYDER, LLP 11350 Random Hills Road SUITE 600 FAIRFAX, VA 22030			AHN, SANGWOO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2166	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/748,661	Applicant(s) BHARAT ET AL.	
	Examiner SANGWOO AHN	Art Unit 2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19 – 28, 30, 33 – 36, 39 and 41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19 – 28, 30, 33 – 36, 39 and 41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Claims 19 – 28, 30, 33 – 36, 39 and 41 are pending.

Claims 1 – 18, 29, 31 – 32, 37 – 38 and 40 have been canceled.

Claims 19, 30, 33, 36 and 41 have been amended.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 19, 20, 30, 33, 34, 36 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication Number 2003/0093417 issued to Kagimasa et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,643,661 issued to Polizzi et al..

Regarding claim 19, Kagimasa discloses,

A method, comprising:

permitting multiple users to access, via a network, first news content contained in one or more news documents stored at a document server (paragraph 41 lines 1—2, paragraph 46 lines 1 – 3, et seq.);

sending query data, in response to a portion of the first news content being accessed by at least one of the multiple users, from the document server across at least a portion of the network to a news server (paragraph 44 lines 2 - 6, paragraph 46 lines 9 - 11, paragraph 57 lines 3 - 5, et seq.);

aggregate news content from a plurality of news sources (paragraph 48 lines 1 – 4, paragraph 57 lines 3 – 6, et seq.);

receiving second news content, via the network, at the document server from the news server based on the query data (paragraph 48 lines 1 – 4, paragraph 57 lines 3 – 6, et seq.);

incorporating the second news content into the one or more news documents (Figure 7, paragraph 61, et seq.); and

permitting the multiple users to access, via the network, the second news content at the document server, wherein the document server and the news server comprise different network devices that are connected to the network (Figure 7, paragraph 61, paragraph 11: a document management server storing a plurality of documents and terminals interconnected by a network), .

Kagimasa does not *explicitly* disclose a news server operable to crawl news content from a plurality of news sources.

However, Polizzi discloses a crawl server (the second server) operable to crawl documents on server agents (other servers) by navigating the portal, the intranet, and the Internet, and to gather and download documents from the Internet (store information associated with the crawled documents) (Figure 2 elements 235 and 250, column 12 lines 46 – 67, et seq.). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the data processing art to modify Kagimasa's method of aggregating news content from multiple sources to incorporate Polizzi's method of crawling documents, thus enabling access to multiple computer systems to retrieve data and present them to an individual in a standardized and easy-to-learn format (column 1 lines 46 – 50, et seq.).

Regarding claim 20, Kagimasa discloses executing a search, using the query data, to retrieve the second news content (paragraph 44 lines 2 - 6, paragraph 46 lines 9 - 11, paragraph 57 lines 3 - 5, et seq.).

Regarding claim 30, Kagimasa discloses,

A system, comprising:

a first server configured to:

store a locally created document with news content that contains embedded search queries (paragraph 41 lines 1—2, paragraph 46 lines 1 – 3, et seq.), and

send a search query that was embedded within the news content across at least a portion of a network to a second server (paragraph 44 lines 2 - 6, paragraph 46 lines 9 - 11, paragraph 57 lines 3 - 5, et seq.); and the second server being configured to:

search the news content based on the search query to obtain search results (paragraph 48 lines 1 – 4, paragraph 57 lines 3 – 6, et seq.), and

provide particular news content to the first server based on the search results (paragraph 48 lines 1 – 4, paragraph 57 lines 3 – 6, et seq.); the first server being further configured to:

permit a plurality of clients to access, from across the network, the locally created document with the news content and the particular news content received from the second server, where the first server, the second server, and the plurality of remote servers comprise different network devices that connect to the network (Figure 7, paragraph 61, paragraph 11: a document management server storing a plurality of documents and terminals interconnected by a network).

Kagimasa does not explicitly indicate that the second server is operable to crawl a corpus of news documents hosted on other servers.

However, Polizzi discloses a crawl server (the second server) operable to crawl documents on server agents (other servers) by navigating the portal, the intranet, and the Internet, and to gather and download documents from the Internet (store information associated with the crawled documents) (Figure 2 elements 235 and 250, column 12 lines 46 – 67, et seq.). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the data processing art to modify Kagimasa's method of aggregating news content from multiple sources to incorporate Polizzi's method of crawling documents, thus enabling access to multiple computer systems to retrieve data and present them to an individual in a standardized and easy-to-learn format (column 1 lines 46 – 50, et seq.).

Regarding claim 33, Miyasaka discloses,

A method, comprising:

embedding search queries in selected locations of news content documents stored at a first server (paragraph 44 lines 2 - 6, paragraph 46 lines 9 - 11, paragraph 57 lines 3 - 5, et seq.);

receiving, from across a network, a selection of one of the news content documents from a user at a client (paragraph 41 lines 1—2, paragraph 46 lines 1 – 3, et seq.);

retrieving one of the embedded search queries in response to receiving the selection of the one of the news content documents (paragraph 44 lines 2 - 6, paragraph 46 lines 9 - 11, paragraph 57 lines 3 - 5, et seq.); and

sending query data, that includes the one of the embedded search queries, from the first server to the client across at least a portion of a network to allow the client, using the query data, to retrieve news content from a second server (paragraph 44 lines 2 - 6, paragraph 46 lines 9 - 11, paragraph 57 lines 3 - 5, et seq.).

Kagimasa does not explicitly indicate that the second server is operable to crawl a corpus of news documents hosted on other servers and store information associated with the crawled documents.

However, Polizzi discloses a crawl server (the second server) operable to crawl documents on server agents (other servers) by navigating the portal, the intranet, and the Internet, and to gather and download documents from the Internet (store information associated with the crawled documents) (Figure 2 elements 235 and 250, column 12

Art Unit: 2166

lines 46 – 67, et seq.). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the data processing art to modify Kagimasa's method of aggregating news content from multiple sources to incorporate Polizzi's method of crawling documents, thus enabling access to multiple computer systems to retrieve data and present them to an individual in a standardized and easy-to-learn format (column 1 lines 46 – 50, et seq.).

Regarding claim 34, Kagimasa discloses searching the repository of documents based on the one of the embedded search queries to obtain the news content and sending the obtained news content from the second server to the client across the network (paragraph 48 lines 1 – 4, paragraph 57 lines 3 – 6, et seq.).

Regarding claim 36, Kagimasa discloses,

A method, comprising:

embedding search queries of news content documents stored at a first server (paragraph 44 lines 2 - 6, paragraph 46 lines 9 - 11, paragraph 57 lines 3 - 5, et seq.);

receiving, from across a network, a selection of one of the news content documents from a user at a client (paragraph 41 lines 1—2, paragraph 46 lines 1 – 3, et seq.);

retrieving one of the embedded search queries in response to receiving the selection of the one of the news content documents (paragraph 44 lines 2 - 6, paragraph 46 lines 9 - 11, paragraph 57 lines 3 - 5, et seq.);

sending query data, that includes the one of the embedded search queries, from the first server to a second server that has stored information associated with other

related documents (paragraph 44 lines 2 - 6, paragraph 46 lines 9 - 11, paragraph 57 lines 3 - 5, et seq.);

receiving, at the first server, news content from the second server that is related to the query data (paragraph 48 lines 1 - 4, paragraph 57 lines 3 - 6, et seq.);

populating one or more documents of the news content documents with the received news content for access by the user (Figure 7, paragraph 61, paragraph 11: a document management server storing a plurality of documents and terminals interconnected by a network).

Kagimasa does not explicitly indicate that the second server is operable to crawl a corpus of news documents hosted on other servers.

However, Polizzi discloses a crawl server (the second server) operable to crawl documents on server agents (other servers) by navigating the portal, the intranet, and the Internet, and to gather and download documents from the Internet (store information associated with the crawled documents) (Figure 2 elements 235 and 250, column 12 lines 46 - 67, et seq.). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the data processing art to modify Kagimasa's method of aggregating news content from multiple sources to incorporate Polizzi's method of crawling documents, thus enabling access to multiple computer systems to retrieve data and present them to an individual in a standardized and easy-to-learn format (column 1 lines 46 - 50, et seq.).

Regarding claim 39, Kagimasa discloses the query data includes at least a portion of text from the selected one of the news content documents (paragraph 53, et seq.)

Claims 21 – 28 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication Number 2003/0093417 issued to Kagimasa and Polizzi, further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,581,072 issued to Mathur et al..

Regarding claim 21, Kagimasa and Polizzi discloses the method of claim 20.

Kagimasa and Polizzi do not explicitly disclose the query data comprising a URL associated with the portion of the first news content.

However, Mathur discloses the query data comprising a URL associated with the portion of the first news content in column 11 lines 25 – 33 (information identifying the location of the web pages (e.g. URLs corresponding to the web pages)). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time the invention was made to modify Kagimasa and Polizzi's system to incorporate the query data comprising a URL as taught by Mathur, thus enabling identification of documents of interest with minimal user intervention.

Regarding claim 22, Mathur discloses retrieving at least a portion of text of the portion of the first news content using the URL and generating a search query for use in the search based, at least in part, on the at least a portion of the text (column 11 lines 25 – 33, et seq.).

Regarding claim 23, Kagimasa discloses the at least a portion of the text of the portion of the first new content comprises key words of the portion of the first news content (paragraph 53, et seq.).

Regarding claim 24, Kagimasa discloses the news server aggregates news content from a plurality of news sources and groups the news content (paragraph 48 lines 1 – 4, paragraph 57 lines 3 – 6, et seq.).

Regarding claim 25, Mathur discloses the search compares the URL with the grouped news content to determine a group from the grouped news content to which the URL belongs (column 11 lines 25 – 33, et seq.).

Regarding claim 26, Kagimasa discloses the query data comprises a textual portion of the selected news content (paragraph 53, et seq.).

Regarding claim 27, Kagimasa discloses generating a search query for use in the search based on the textual portion of the selected news content (paragraph 53, et seq.).

Regarding claim 28, Kagimasa discloses the text portion of the first news content comprises key words of the portion of the first news content (paragraph 53, et seq.).

Regarding claim 41, Kagimasa and Mathur disclose fetching the selected one of the news content documents using the URL (Mathur: column 11 lines 25 – 33, et seq.), generating a search query based on keywords of the fetched one of the news content document (Kagimasa: paragraph 53, et seq.), and searching the repository to obtain the news content (Kagimasa: paragraph 48 lines 1 – 4, paragraph 57 lines 3 – 6, et seq.).

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kagimasa and Polizzi, further in view of U.S. Publication Number 2005/0027666 issued to Beck et al. (hereinafter “Beck”).

Regarding claim 35, Miyasaka and Polizzi disclose the method of claim 33.

Kagimasa and Polizzi do not explicitly disclose the embedded search queries in the form of an applet or a hyper text markup language (HTML) iframe.

However, Beck discloses the aforementioned feature in paragraph 24. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time the invention was made to modify Kagimasa and Polizzi's method to incorporate Beck's use of hyper text markup language iframe, thus enabling an interactive online research system, locating an online site or document to present to a user.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2166

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SANGWOO AHN whose telephone number is (571)272-5626. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

4/23/2008

/S. A./

Examiner, Art Unit 2166

/Hosain T Alam/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2166